Application No. 09/992,190 Amendment "D" dated March 22, 2005 Reply to Office Action mailed January 27, 2005

## **REMARKS**

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on March 17, 2004. The following remarks are consistent with the issues discussed during the interview.

The latest Office Action mailed October 22, 2004, considered and rejected claims 1-38 in view of Portuesi (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,509).

As discussed during the interview, however, Portuesi is not valid prior art as applied to the present case inasmuch as the present application is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/900,417, which was filed on July 25, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application 08/641,517, having disclosure supporting the present claims, and which was filed on May 1, 1996. Accordingly, inasmuch as Portuesi only claims priority to a filing date of a parent application filed on October 18, 1996, it is not prior art as applied to the present case.

Disclosure supporting Applicants claims from the earlier application (08/900,417) includes, but is not limited to the disclosure found on pages 13-19 and 60-61, which clearly supports displaying a television program at an interactive television system with a hyperlink to interactive content; accessing the data/content through the hyperlink (i.e., selection of the hyperlink); pausing the display of the television program during navigation of the content (i.e., in response to selection of the hyperlink and obtaining the data corresponding to the hyperlink, while the television program is being broadcast); time-shifting the television program while it is paused; and as the display of the television program is paused, displaying the data corresponding to the hyperlink.

Application No. 09/992,190
Amendment "D" dated March 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed January 27, 2005

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the earlier identified application supports the pending claims, that Portuesi is invalid prior art as applied to the present application, and that the claims should therefore now be allowed.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22 day of March, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER Registration No. 28,651 JENS C. JENKINS

Registration No. 44,803 Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm W:\14531\71.4.2\CM0000005096V001.DOC